

Remarks/Arguments

Status of the Application

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and objections set forth in the Office Action mailed on June 29, 2005.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-11 and 30-35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,926,474 to *Bolosky et al.* (*Bolosky*).

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-3, 12-13, 26-29, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,365,189 to *Kendall et al.* (*Kendall*).

Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10-13, 26-28, 31, 33, and 36-37.

Claims 14-25 remain cancelled.

As such, claims 1-13, and 26-37 are pending in this application.

The Claims

Cited Art

Bolosky

Bolosky discloses “[a] system [that] includes protection against *multiple senders in a multipoint to point data funnel* that connects multiple data sources with a single data sink. The protection is afforded by employing tokens and by adopting a token protocol. In particular, *a data source must be in possession of a token in order to send data on to a data funnel*,” (Abstract, *emphasis added*). In using a token based system, “the token serves as evidence of permission to output data,” (Col. 4, ll. 20-21).

Kendall

Kendall discloses, “[a] *real-time distributed data-base system* that stores in the local memory of each processor copies of only those variables necessary for execution of the programs in that processor,” (Abstract, *emphasis added*). Indeed, *Kendall* contemplates interactions between separate processors “by means of well-known remote communications procedures,” (Col. 3, ll. 5-10).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 4-11 and 30-35

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-11 and 30-35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Bolosky*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As noted above, *Bolosky* discloses systems that protects against “multiple senders in a multipoint to point data funnel that connects multiple data sources,” (Abstract, *emphasis added*). In contrast, the claimed invention provides methods “of controlling system operation between a plurality of components in an *integrated circuit*,” (Claim 4, *emphasis added*). Support for the proposed amendment may be found in the Specification at p. 2, ¶¶ 1-2. Thus, the present invention as claimed contemplates handling communication between components in an integrated circuit over a communication medium as opposed to handling communication between multiple senders as described by *Bolosky* (see FIG. 1).

Furthermore, as noted above, *Bolosky* discloses methods of managing communications using a token based scheme. In contrast, the claimed invention requires the, “at least one scheduler sending a *first command* to a first IC component medium,” (Claim 4, *emphasis added*). Support for the proposed amendment may be found in the Specification at p. 2, ¶¶ 1-2. Thus, the present invention as claimed does not require a token. In this manner, communication between components is mediated because, “[s]cheduling decisions are made in advance by the processors and then communicated to the participating components using a transaction protocol,” therefore eliminating any need for a token based schema to provide for only a single component to communicate over a data point at any one time (see Specification p. 4, ¶ 1).

Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that independent claim 4 is patentable over the cited art and therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the above rejection.

Applicant further submits that independent claim 8 is also allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons cited for independent claim 4.

Applicant further submits that claims 5-7, 9-11, 30-35 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 4 and 8 and are therefore patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons cited for claim 4. Additionally, these dependent claims require additional elements

that, when considered in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguishes the art of record. For example, claim 6 requires, "creating a chained sequence of transfers" so that, "each chained sequence can then be performed by the individual components without additional communication with the scheduling processor," (Specification p. 4, ¶ 2). In contrast, *Bolosky* describes no such chained sequences.

Claims 1-3, 12-13, 26-29, and 36-37

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-3, 12-13, 26-29, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kendall*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As noted above, *Kendall* discloses real-time distributed data-base system communication methodology that contemplates interactions between separate processors. In contrast, the claimed invention provides methods "of scheduling communication between a plurality of components in an integrated circuit," (Claim 1, *emphasis added*). Support for the proposed amendment may be found in the Specification at p. 2, ¶¶ 1-2. Thus, the present invention as claimed contemplates handling communication between components in an integrated circuit over a communication medium as opposed to handling communication between separate processors in a real time data-base system as described by *Kendall* (*see* FIG. 1).

Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art and therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the above rejection.

Applicant further submits that independent claim 12 is also allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons cited for independent claim 1.

Applicant further submits that claims 2-3, 13, 26-29, and 36-37 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 12 and are therefore patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons cited for claim 1. Additionally, these dependent claims require additional elements that, when considered in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguishes the art of record.

For example, claims 26-28 require, "creating a chained sequence of transfers" so that, "each chained sequence can then be performed by the individual components without additional

Amendment submitted in response
to Office Action mailed 06/05/2005
U.S. Pat App. No. 09/654,718
October 31, 2005
Page 10

communication with the scheduling processor,” (Specification p. 4, ¶ 2). In contrast, *Kendall* describes no such chained sequences.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
/Damon K. I. Kali/
Damon K. I. Kali
Registration No. 50,541

Tel: 408-257-5500